

## **BECT MEETING SUMMARY**

Friday, May 24, 2013

US Bureau of Reclamation, 801 I Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Sacramento, CA

### **I. Welcome and Introductions**

- Theresa Olson, Conservation and Conveyance Division Chief, welcomed everyone and asked that they sign in. Introductions were made around the room.
- Sign-in sheet is available upon request.
- Some of the future BECT meetings may take on the format of a working group to focus in on detail-specific issues as requested.
- Theresa reviewed the agenda and turned the meeting over to Steve Centerwall with ICF.

### **II. BDCP Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) Update: Major Changes Made from February 2012 Administrative Draft to March 2013 Consultant Administrative Draft**

- Steve presented a PowerPoint presentation (see attached) on major changes in the 2013 Consultant Administrative Draft EIR/EIS.
- The group discussed that Conservation Measure (CM) 1 was project level, while CM2-22 were more programmatic in nature.
- The 2013 Consultant Administrative Draft EIR/EIS has more clarity in impact analysis, and many revisions have been made based on comments; however, still working on incorporating all the comments from last round.
- Mapbooks have been updated with more specific components.
- Additional mitigation measures and environmental commitments have been included.
- All appendices are available except 3.A which may be released in the next few weeks.
- Appendix 3D includes a description of relevant programs and Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives (RPAs) for Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Analysis.
- Questions and comments:
  1. Clarification is needed on which CMs may need additional compliance.
  2. Not all alternatives include the decision tree, seems like not all alternatives have been analyzed to the same level.
  3. A workshop on operations and the decision tree was requested.

### **III. Review of Cooperating Agency Comments to the February 2012 Administrative Draft EIR/EIS**

- A handout was available to each cooperating agency summarizing their comments and responses. Steve reviewed a few pertinent comments and how the comments were incorporated into the document.

- Questions and comments:
  1. A request was made that lead agencies coordinate with Reclamation Districts (RDs) regarding transportation impacts (including those during operations and maintenance phases).
  2. Transportation section was not thorough enough, i.e. effects of truck traffic on levees not fully described. Levees need to be up to standards and fully functioning, and truck traffic can compromise this. It was suggested that there is a need to work with each Reclamation District to further determine traffic impacts and thresholds of significance. Also need to ensure that the mitigation is appropriate for the overall impacts.
  3. There was a request for a workshop specific to transportation impacts.
  4. Water transfers from CM1 that bypass the Delta will have in-Delta effects because they will no longer create flows through Delta. This is a reasonably foreseeable effect and should be analyzed. Full capacity of tunnels at build-out should be analyzed because it creates an increased potential for additional transfers.
  5. Steve stated that there currently is no proposal for additional transfers and these transfers must be “reasonably foreseeable” for analysis
  6. Water supply analysis does not address project effects on water supply into Delta for beneficial uses.
  7. A Water Transfer Appendix is to be added.

#### **IV. Review of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (document emailed on May 22, 2013)**

- Impact Table 4 shows over 600 impacts and mitigation measures for Alternative 4. Although NEPA does not require mitigation, significance will be determined in the Record of Decision. CEQA does require mitigation.
- Questions and comments:
  1. It was reiterated that a water quality workgroup is needed. A specific workshop just on water issues including transfers, water supply, water quality and capacity was requested.
  2. It was suggested that water supply was analyzed for water contractors but not for in-Delta use.
  3. There was a question regarding river height differences in the Delta for each alternative. Information is provided in Appendix 5A that has average monthly operations. This may not be a fine enough scale, and daily operations may be needed.
  4. It would be helpful to have an appendix with DSM2 outputs at 15 minute intervals
  5. There was discussion regarding groundwater wells near construction sites, and if the contractor had modeled well locations. Some have been, but many private well information is not available. Question of how to determine mitigation for incomplete well data sets.
  6. BDCP and Delta Farmland paper being developed by Katy Spanos is going out to Cooperating Agencies next week.
  7. A process is being developed for how to reuse tunnel muck i.e. for restoration, levees.

8. Seepage resulting from borrow/spoils pits should be analyzed further in Surface Water chapter. Analysis of seepage effects on islands and on drainage systems is needed.

**V. Process, Input, and Next Steps**

- Theresa stated that comments were due July 5<sup>th</sup>. Melinda Terry (NDWA) requested an additional week to submit comments. Theresa Olson will check with Federico Barajas. **Completed. An extension to July 12, 2013 was granted.**
- Theresa will discuss with Federico setting up the next BECT and formulating workgroups for the following:
  1. Operations and the decision tree
  2. Transportation effects
  3. Water supply, water quality, capacity, water levels below tunnels (and invite CVP contractors (i.e. Contra Costa County) as well as other relevant cooperating agencies)
  4. Water transfers (once water transfer appendix is released by DWR).